



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Critical Notes

קָהָל IN THE SONG OF SONGS

The Song of Songs has been the shuttlecock of biblical interpretation and its study a kind of recreative pastime from the more serious pursuits of critical investigation, an approach quite naturally induced by that earlier sacred sport of allegorizing, which found in this book opportunity for such unlimited diversion.

The peculiar character of the poem has also had its share in the result. The nature of the piece has not permitted the application of the usual canons of criticism, in a manner to secure a decision, without so much assumption of background or modification of the text that the one constant assertion which can safely be made of the history of its interpretation is that the personal equation has never yet failed to determine the outcome. Indeed it is just here that the criticism of the poem has attained assured results. It has been able to demonstrate this proposition, or what amounts to the same thing, that no theory of the piece yet propounded can be made to fit the poem as it stands without a very disconcerting plus or minus. This applies to the various species of allegories, the two, the three, and the five main character theories. Whether all of them have suffered equally and beyond repair is another matter, but that a broad shadow of uncertainty rests upon them all is beyond controversy.

The case for the Syrian wedding theory may be thought by a defenseless reader of Old Testament introduction to be upon a different plane in this respect, but a careful perusal even of such general works will not warrant the inference. This theory is somewhat generally accepted as less objectionable than others, but the number of deletions, transpositions, and modifications of the text, to say nothing of some very strained analogies, as given in the accredited exposition of this hypothesis,¹ leaves no doubt in this particular. Moreover, one must ask by what criteria the changes of the text are made. Solely then, it must be said, because they do not fit a group of customs observed in North Syria in 1861 A.D., coming from a region whose civilization represents a syncretism of many cultures, customs that in their present form have not as yet been shown to exist anywhere as far back as the Christian era, much less in Israel at any time. The method is to that extent questionable and unsound, and if applied on a similar scale to the rest of the Old Testament would seriously jeopardize all criticism. This interpretation rests upon an analogy, valuable enough in itself, but separated by more than two thousand years from its supposed source, which is hidden

¹ K. Budde in Marti's *Handkommentar*.

from us, and as a norm for the Song of Songs it becomes as valuable, perhaps, as modern Chinese phonetics in establishing the origin of the Sumerian language. One of its prominent commendations has been its freedom from some of the more glaring vices of earlier theories. It requires no troublesome $x+$; on the other hand, its own $-x-y+z$ is scarcely less serious and remains unresolved.

It is just here that the proverbial fly in the ointment, with every attempted solution of this poem, is most in evidence. It has always been found necessary, in order to accomplish anything with this book, to operate with an unknown x , and the outcome in every case is scarcely better than an algebraic formula, so far as excluding other alternatives is concerned, however much each is to be commended over its predecessors, in the eyes of various individuals.

This inability throughout the ages to take the poem, as it stands, as essentially neither more nor less and yet account for its phenomena has scarcely received the attention it deserves. This lack can hardly be charged to the writer or compiler. This is against all analogy and ought to be frankly recognized. The only obvious conclusion is that the text has suffered in some way in transmission, and yet this ought not to be regarded as equivalent to the granting of a license to correct the text indiscriminately. The piece has many marks of unity, and almost without exception some sort of unity has been granted it. It will be legitimate, then, to examine the text to see if it shows any trace of omission or uncertainty that might give a reasonable clue, for if such a thing has occurred we have no analogy for assuming that it could be accomplished without leaving a trace.

Now there is one point of uncertainty in the text as it stands, which from the outset has put a question mark after every interpretation of the book, and that is the inability either to identify or to distinguish with certainty the person addressed as דָּדּוּ ("my beloved") and the character King Solomon. This item is one, scarcely to have been overlooked by the writer, since it deals with the primary meaning of the poem and not only represents an important personage, referred to in every speech of the leading character, but it is a personal epithet used as many times as all others in the poem combined.

An examination of this word minus the suffix reveals a common Semitic form (Arabic دَاد, Aramaic דָּד, Assyrian *dādû*, Hebrew דָּד, Minean דָּד, Palmyrene 𐤃𐤃, Sabea דָּד, Syriac ܕܕܐ). In Hebrew, outside the Song, the singular occurs eighteen times, always to be translated "uncle" (one apparent exception in Isa. 5:1 is corrupt and in any case cannot be used against the foregoing meaning). The absolute of the word, which occurs four times in the Song, once in Proverbs (7:18) and twice in Ezekiel (16:8; 23:17), is always to be rendered as an intensive "love" (Gesenius, 124, *e*). The form points to a hollow root, דָּד, from whence come the proper names Dādû, Dido, Dodo, Dudu, David, and some others. In the Song the singular is

used outside the expression דָּדַי four times in the pointed text (5:9; 6:1), but two of these instances refer to the same personage as "thy דָּדַי" and "her דָּדַי." In the other two cases the word is used alone in the absolute sense (to be examined later).

The form translated "my beloved" ought, according to Hebrew usage, elsewhere to be translated "my uncle," but this is clearly inappropriate here. Now there are twenty-two other cases in Hebrew of this particular kind of formation from other roots, where the root meaning is fairly definite, and these forms invariably signify either the exercise of the quality expressed by the verb root, and so form abstracts, or they denote objects that exercise the verbal quality. Accordingly, our word, inasmuch as a sense of endearment always seems to adhere to it, can at most be translated "love" or "lover," but neither quite suits in this context. The meaning "my beloved" appears to have no warrant in Hebrew usage, and this gains added weight from the wider Semitic field. The prevailing meaning here is "uncle" also, varying to include "cousin" in Syriac and Minean. In Arabic it signifies "foster-father," and in Assyrian alone it is used as a synonym of "son" and has the derived meanings "caress" and "darling." This is natural when applied to offspring, but this usage does not occur outside of Assyrian. The form דָּדַי in the Song becomes the more suspicious, also, since there was a perfectly good form from a related root that does quite naturally mean "beloved" (יָדַי).

The two cases where the word occurs alone in the absolute sense are usually translated: "What is thy beloved more than another beloved" (5:9). This rendering supplies the crucial word "another" and so is inadmissible. The only translation compatible with grammar would be: "What is thy love more than love?" or "thy lover more than a lover?" but neither of these alternatives suits the question asked, as the context clearly shows. The pointed text cannot be right, therefore, and we cannot look for the meaning of our word from this context (I shall return to this verse later).

This leads us to look for some fresh rendering for the form דָּדַי. Now when we observe the consonantal text alone it is evident that this word can equally well be a perfectly good proper name, found in II Sam. 23:9 (*kethîb*) and I Chron. 27:4, and pronounced "Dodai." This is a kind of formation that appears widely, and compounds from this root are recognized as ancient, and they early become obsolete.¹ It would not be strange, accordingly, if such a name should later be mistaken for a common noun, as is so frequently the case in the LXX. Supplying, then, this reading wherever "my beloved" appears in the English version, a very definite result follows. Any serious need for "stage instructions" of any sort completely disappears. The antithesis of shepherd lover and the king is complete and mandatory in every instance.

¹ G. B. Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names*, p. 63

There are still asides and reminiscences of the absent lover, but there is never the slightest doubt as to the meaning and intention of the main parts. The poem becomes a necessary unity. The contrasts between the heroine and the daughters of Jerusalem, the king and the shepherd, the wholesome free life of the country and the sordid life of the royal court, all stand out in sharpest colors, and the poem is a very definite satire upon the age and ideals of Solomon and a glorification of the northern schism, and that too without the necessary deletion of a single letter of the original.

We may inquire in the first place whether the confusion of the true reading, as suggested above, can be more particularly accounted for. Such a test cannot always be complied with, but wherever possible its importance may not be overlooked. There is here a double consideration. First of all the poem was handed down through the Jews of the Southern Kingdom, where the glory of Solomon represented the very acme of national splendor. The worst recorded criticism of him in the south is that of the Deuteronomic redactor of the Books of Kings, and in his case, in spite of Solomon's many foreign wives and the idolatrous practices of his later life, he is still clearly the *grand monarque*. He is criticized neither for his economic oppression, his insensate extravagance and luxury, nor for the size of his vast harem in itself; and so far as the last point is concerned his sixty wives in the Song are in any case a mere bagatelle compared with the six hundred of I Kings, chap. 11. This marks the lowest depth of disapproval, and from this point onward Solomon's star of national favor steadily rises. Psalms are ascribed to him. He is a voluminous poet (I Kings 4:32), the great botanist, zoölogist, ornithologist, and ichthyologist of his day, but above all he is the patron of wisdom and himself unsurpassed among humankind for his original utterances on the subject (I Kings 5:33). It is evident that no piece of literature that mentioned his name could persist in the south, much less gain a place of distinction that did not honor and dignify his character; still less could a satire upon his reign ever gain a place in the sun. Clearly to a Jew of the south Solomon's attention to the peasant girl in the Song could only be regarded in the light of the honor which he conferred upon her by such magnanimous condescension, for otherwise why should it be written?

Now there were in the language of the poem itself two points where the transference of the name "Dodai" to a mere epithet, which could be applied to Solomon, seemed to be favored. This is the second consideration, and to it must be added the observation that when the northern literature found a refuge in the south, after the fall of the northern state, we must reckon with at least a slight break in the oral tradition of such consonantal texts as well as a change of social and political viewpoint. This observation is amply illustrated by the present history of the Northern Kingdom in the Books of Kings.

In 5:9 and 8:5 the epithet of the lover appears with another suffix and at least in the latter the י of דודי was absent entirely. In 5:9 the

pronominal suffix of the second person was added and the final י of דָּוִד may or may not have been written in the copy which persisted (Gesenius, 91, *k*). In favor of its omission see Gesenius, 8, *b*, 3 and 8, *l* (*a*). If it were written it was permissible to regard it as representing the long *sêrê* before the suffix (Gesenius, 7, *g*; 8, *b*, 3). Here then was permission to take the consonants of דָּוִד as composed of דָּוִד plus the singular suffix י, and this was particularly encouraged by the comparison with the singular absolute form דָּוִד in the same verse (and if so used here it would of course be applicable to all cases of its occurrence in the poem). As I have already intimated, this verse has never been successfully translated. The word דָּוִד can neither be translated "love," "lover," nor "beloved" in this context and give any suitable sense. It is, however, a perfectly good writing of the name "David," and that too in its oldest form.¹ The verse will then read: "What is thy Dodai in comparison with David? What is thy Dodai in comparison with David that thou dost so adjure us?" This is at once positive and definite, the reference to David being, in that case, not, to be sure, to the individual David, but to his house in the person of the reigning king; exactly as, e.g., Solomon's son Rehoboam is referred to in I Kings 12:16 (a still broader use of the name "David," approximating the term "Pharaoh" in Egypt, well attested in later times, is in line with the same usage). The verse was intended as a knock-out blow for the Shulammitte by the court ladies, in the form of an ironical question, but the maiden takes it literally and is able to convince them that it has a positive answer in her favor. The primary ambiguity of the passage lay in the radicals of the name "David," which were the more readily misunderstood since the king in the poem was clearly not David but Solomon. The reason, however, for the choice of "David" in this case is obvious in the marked assonance with Dodai, which it permitted and which would tend to make the comparison more striking.

In 8:5 the singular דָּוִד is followed in the pointed text by the short form of the third feminine pronominal suffix. As it stands we can only read "her דָּוִד," but this has never given a satisfactory verse. It reads: "Who is this coming up from the wilderness leaning upon her דָּוִד?" "Her דָּוִד," then, means nothing at all, or it signifies that the brothers of the Shulammitte, in uttering it, recognize that their sister has returned; but the syntax of the sentence does not suit a rhetorical question such as is then needed (Gesenius, 151, 1), and the Shulammitte had not been in the wilderness. A woman from the wilderness could only naturally mean a Bedouin, and yet the sequel shows that the Shulammitte is intended. The incongruity will be removed if the proper name be read in place of "her דָּוִד." The verse may then read: "Who is this coming up from the wilderness leaning upon Dodā?" (or since a young woman is certainly meant, it may be preferable to read עֲלֵמָה for עֲלָה, so that we should then translate "Who [or how] is this? a young woman from the wilderness, leaning upon Dodā!").

¹ Cf. BDB, p. 187b.

That is, the form *Dodā* is here pausal, and it is the only pausal form of the name recorded. Such a form naturally requires a long *ā* at the end. The final ׀ in place of ׀ is used to express that. This is an irregular writing in nouns, according to the stereotyped Massoretic formula, but may at one time have been quite regular in the living language (Gesenius 7, *f*, note 1), and it finds direct analogy in the entire class of ׀ verbs. An alternative explanation may also be that the name was pronounced *Dodô* in pause, and we may compare a considerable number of nouns ending in *ai* in the *kethib* where the *kerê* requires a final *ô*. The pausal forms would make a very suitable point for that transition.

The verse as thus rendered expresses the incredulity of the brothers that their well-known friend, *Dodai*, should be found associating with a strange woman. They have no surmise that it is their sister, whom they have good reason to think is at the capital; and yet their amazement shows a much finer art in introducing her to her old home surroundings, so that the reading of the proper name considerably relieves and improves the verse. In both of the passages under consideration, while an outward separation of ׀׀׀ seems feasible, yet a closer scrutiny reveals serious and inherent difficulties, which nothing but the fixed determination to glorify Solomon at all costs could have overlooked.

We may inquire in the second place what light the reading of the proper name throws on the history of the book's interpretation. The allegory was perhaps the only means of preserving the poem after the identity of the shepherd had been lost. Until that happened Solomon was of course the villain, not the hero, of the piece, and the later allegory was impossible. The two-character theory hangs together with the allegory and the poem fell into allegory to save its own *raison d'être*. The theory of Herder and others who made the work a loose collection of folk poetry was as well justified as the allegory as long as the inner structure of the book was not clear. The three-character theory followed the logic of the poem to its true conclusion but could not show how it must be so and not otherwise. The wedding theory was able to gain a show of plausibility only because the structure of the poem had been blurred by the misreading of one word (׀׀׀) twenty-eight times. None of these vagaries would have been possible if the text had been fully written.¹

Thirdly, let us consider how this rendering affects the literary merit of the poem. The Shulammitte's naming of her lover instead of declaring her exact relation to him from the first has the decided artistic advantage of only gradually revealing the depth of her attachment for her betrothed, a love, moreover, that now moves forward like a deep welling crescendo of

¹ Analysis of Song of Songs as here presented: court ladies (one or more), 1:1-2, 4, 8; 5:9; 6:1; 7:2-7; the Shulammitte, 1:3, 5-7, 12-14, 16-2:1, 3-3:5; 4:7-5:8, 10-18; 6:2-3, 11-12; 7:1*b*, 10*b*-8:4, 6-12, 14; Solomon 1:9-11, 15; 2:2; 4:1-6; 6:4-10; 7:1*a*, 8-10*a*; a bystander, 3:6-8 (9-10); attendant, 3:11; the brothers of the Shulammitte, 8:5*a*; *Dodai*, 8:5*b*, 13.

purest passion. It adds to the Shulammitte's parrying of the king's advances a dramatic power and a brilliancy of artistic finish that before were almost wholly obscured. It is just this gradual discovery of the depth and meaning of true affection, on the one hand, by the women of the court that finally wins their wondering sympathy and approval; and, on the other, its contrary effect of revealing the sensual king in his true colors, for as he makes his amorous advances he gradually feels its growing power, loses countenance, repeats himself, and becomes confused, and his appeal sinks to a base brute passion that is eventually rendered dumb and helpless in the presence of the glowing fires of a pure affection that proves a very flame of Yah. And the maiden is free, and she passes from our view over the green hills of her native countryside with a song on her lips, arm in arm with the chosen youth of her troth.

This discussion if valid has this significance for the lexicon, that דוד in Hebrew always means "uncle"; in the plural it is always an abstract, "love," "affection"; דודים in the Song is, with one possible exception, a proper name.

The presence of Dodai as a proper name by its very prominence raises a problem with reference to the subject of the poem, which can now for the first time be intelligently discussed. The heading "The Song of Songs" is more of a particular classification than it is a title, and is one scarcely to have been added by the author, for in any case it is closely bound up with the following clause, "which is Solomon's." The Song outwardly centers around the Shulammitte. It is the assigned task of the court ladies to arouse her affection for the king, but their only effect is to call forth longings, memories, and ideal descriptions of Dodai until their mouths are stopped in hungry admiration. Solomon seeks to woo her, but she parries every attempted compliment of the king with a finer, deeper appreciation of Dodai until the stock phrases of the king are exhausted, and the ordeal brings the maiden to her final statement, before the king, of her undying devotion to her betrothed, and it is this as she tells us later that wins her release (8:10). It is a *song about Dodai* that silences the court, that baffles the king, that keeps up the courage of the Shulammitte, and that finally procures her freedom and triumph. This is the subject of the poem whether it ever stood at the beginning or not. But if it did so at one time it was removed as unnecessary and superfluous after the heading "The Song of Songs, which is Solomon's" had been completed and דודים identified with Solomon.

In favor of this earlier title is its occurrence once in Isa. 5:1, where שירת דוד is the most plausible reading.¹ This so far as it has weight points to a date for the poem compatible with the natural inference from the Song itself (6:4), that the book was written while Tirzah was capital of North Israel. It is to be noted also that the reading of דוד in Isa. 5:1 as a proper name makes a decision possible with reference to the vexed problem of the

¹ Cf. Gray *ICC*, *ad loc.*

song of the vineyard (Isa. 5:1 ff.) in a manner to justify the rendering of the LXX as approximately correct, so that by recognizing לִידִידִי (vs. 1c) as a transposed form of an original לִי יִידִי, due to the presence of לִידִידִי in vs. 1a, the Song becomes consistent throughout and it becomes possible to trace the evolution of the present Hebrew text from this initial error, first by changing לִכְרֵמִי (vs. 1b) to לִכְרֵמֶיךָ, to accord with לִידִידִי (vs. 1c), and then the following verbs in verse 2 were altered from the first to the third person in order to be consistent with the foregoing changes in verse 1.

With the topic of the Song clear, it is evident why *the song of Dodai* was popular in the north, and also why the theme commanded such poetic genius. It was much more than a love song, or the concern of its two-leading characters. It would be too much to call it an allegory, although it approaches it, and this circumstance helps to explain the later allegorizing. The house of David had forcibly drawn away the northern allegiance to the southern capital for a brief period, but it was never whole-heartedly accepted, while the oppressive extravagance of Solomon, his vast harem, and his inordinate luxury became more and more repugnant to the frugal and relatively free peasantry of the north, until the final break came. If the soul of a nation speaks in Job, the Song of Songs permitted the voicing of the spirit of Israelitish independence from the house of David, particularly during the period when the struggle was rather closely matched and before Israel gained an assured superiority.

The linguistic peculiarities of the Song are numerous and difficult, but there are three words in particular whose use in the poem has been looked upon as a strong argument against an early date, namely, the particle **שֵׁן**, **אֶפְרַיִם**, **פִּרְדָּס**. So far as the first is concerned, it is not so much its early use that occasions difficulty, since that is attested sporadically, as it is its exclusive use in the Song. I consider the discussion by Cannon¹ to be very fair, although I should include in addition the possible influence of Assyrian *ša* upon the use of **שֵׁן** in North Israel, and whether it alone favors an early or a late date, it is not proved to be incompatible with either. As to **אֶפְרַיִם**, there seems to be no reason to question Driver's remark² that it resembles Gr. *φορῶν* more than Sansk. *paryāṇka*, but 3:9-10 is with Cannon to be taken as a gloss, and for the added reason that it is the only instance where the poem dwells with manifest delight upon anything connected with Solomon's possessions or estate. Contrast, on the other hand, the manner in which the book revels in the beauties of nature and the charms of rural life; but in 3:9-10 the interest is in a minor point and it is developed until it is fairly top-heavy. This together with its isolated character make it best accounted for as the later expansion of a glossator.

פִּרְדָּס (4:13) presents more difficulty. It must be granted that we do not expect it in early Hebrew; nevertheless our positive knowledge is scarcely

¹ *The Song of Songs*, excursus III, p. 145.

² *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 450.

such as to exclude it definitely (cf. Assy. *par-di-su*). But as it stands פֶּרֶס is in a context that is anything but clear, and until this is determined with much more definiteness it is hazardous to base any far-reaching conclusion on its appearance here. What is שְׁלֹחֶיךָ? "Thy plants" or "what grows in thee" is unsuitable, first because the figure of a fountain certainly precedes, in which plants do not grow, and secondly because the suffix "thy" makes the great variety of plants, and especially trees, too much within, and too much to be within, the person of the beloved. The suffix "thy" is very harsh. The proposal to correct the text so as to read שְׁנֵי לִחְיֶיךָ (Perles) is still more grotesque. Such a figure might serve for a bearded Semite man, but no lover certainly would ever dream of applying it to a blooming maiden's cheek. If the figure of the fountain be retained, then the sense of שְׁלֹחֶיךָ, as ἀποστολαί(η) (LXX), is straightforward, and we must point שְׁלֹחֶיךָ or שְׁלֹחֶיךָ, "conduit," "outflow" (Gesenius-Buhl, p. 847), but in that case παράδεισος is not a natural predicate. In the second place why did the LXX omit רְבוֹן, an omission noted both by Origen (cf. Hexapla) and the corrector of א? It may be urged that such omissions are too frequent to expect to discover a specific cause; nevertheless in this particular case we should be able to account for all the phenomena if some other word than פֶּרֶס were, along with רְבוֹן, rendered by παράδεισος.

Field's *Hexapla* has the supplementary note: "Montef. ad h.l. affert: εβρ. ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου παράδεισος ροῶν notans, 'sic Reg. unus Pericopii codex.'" This reading, although manifestly conflate, cannot be ignored, and its logical explanation disposes of פֶּרֶס. The Latin comment in Field asserts that "... interpres ille in voce שְׁלֹחֶיךָ *emissiones tuae*, litteram שְׁ pro particula habet . . . לִחְיֶיךָ vero quasi significet maxilla tua, vel os tua." This is highly improbable for several reasons. First, the meaning assigned to שְׁ is without parallel and non-Hebraic; secondly, לִחְיֶיךָ in this context is not correctly rendered by στόματος; and, thirdly, the phrase ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου is by this means left hanging in the air; and accordingly the Hebrew underlying this phrase is not שְׁלֹחֶיךָ but שְׁלַח פִּיךָ וְאֵל שְׁלֹחֶיךָ. That is, the פ of our פֶּרֶס was before instead of after י. That leaves the remaining radicals רֶדֶס not necessarily in their original order, since that may well have been affected by the addition of פ, and as a matter of fact they will make no sense as they stand, but by rearrangement we gain the form סֶדֶר, "row," "rank" (Assyr. *sidru*, *sidirtu*, "battle line"), and סֶדֶר רְבוֹן or, reading with the Syro-Hex., סֶדֶר רְבוֹן yield an appropriate sense, namely, that of rows of pomegranates planted along a watercourse leading to a spring. The line will then read: "The overflow of thy outlet is a row of pomegranates," etc., the outflow being conceived as transformed into living fragrance and life-giving fruit. "Rows of pomegranates," when preceded by the somewhat ambiguous שְׁלַח and followed by the rather long list of other plants, in a

context that required some sort of inclosure, may well have suggested *παράδεισος* to the Greek translators. The accidental transposition of פ, resulting in פסדר, gave a form that could not be construed, but Semitic contact with Indo-Europeans had already produced Assyrian *par-di-su* and Hebrew פדרס, and the LXX rendering of סדר רמון, etc., could not fail to suggest פדרס as the obvious solution. This will explain why the LXX appropriately omitted רמון, but after the formulation of פדרס the omission was rightly regarded as improper. The figurative force of the verse now fits in admirably with what precedes and what follows, namely, a garden fountain in both cases, and the direct personal element in the figure that stands out so prominently in the suffix "thy" and rather harshly in the existing text can now be quite as readily construed personally, thus: "The overflow of thy lips is a source of life-giving sweet and beautiful words." If the above represents the true process of the text, the LXX, to be sure, shows no trace of פיד. This may have been due, however, either to the desire to avoid what seemed to be a harsh figure (cf. Ps. 18:10) or it may have been occasioned by conscious abbreviation (cf. Deut. 17:6 and also 21:17). For a tendency in the opposite direction see I Sam. 1:23 (LXX).

LERoy WATERMAN

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE NAME MOSES

In the October issue of this *Journal*, in my article upon "Southern Influences upon Hebrew Prophecy" (p. 6, n. 4), I called attention to some of the data bearing upon the question as to whether or not the name "Moses" might be derived from the Egyptian word *mś*. I noted that no case of an Egyptian *ś* coming over into Semitic as *š* had yet been found, but went on to say in the light of existing facts, "It should be noted, however, that the known cases of *ś* transliterated are very few in all, and that it is probable that were we to have a larger number we should have ט and ש both representing *ś*. The absence of ש is probably purely accidental."

Since the appearance of that article my friend Dr. T. George Allen has called my attention to a name in the Amarna letters that is of first-class importance for this question and fully establishes the legitimacy of my contention. In Knudtzon, No. 113, ll. 36, 43 and No. 114, l. 51, letters from Rib-Addi to the Pharaoh, there occurs the name of an Egyptian official written *A-ma-an-ma-ša*. This is clearly the good Egyptian name Amen-mose, which occurs frequently in the period of the eighteenth dynasty, as Ranke pointed out in *Keilschrift. Material zur Altägyptischen Vokalisation* (Berlin: Reimer, 1910), p. 8; cf. Knudtzon, p. 1212. Several other examples of the transliteration of Egyptian *ś* by Semitic *š* occur in Egyptian names and